

Remarks

Fifty-nine (59) claims now appear in this application. Claims 1, 35 and 36 have been canceled. Claims 2-5, 7-11, 13, 14, 20, 24, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34 and 38 have been amended, and Claims 39-62 have been added to further protect applicant's invention. Claims 15-26 have been indicated as being allowable over the prior art of record.

Applicant is going to have new drawings prepared with the required changes incorporated therein. Applicant may delay filing of the new drawings until receipt of a "Notice of Allowability".

In view of the number of claims involved, necessary because of the importance of this invention to the growth of applicant's business, a special effort has been made to aid the Examiner, and anyone else reading the file history later, in understanding the status of each claim, and applicant's position.

Claim 1 has been canceled.

Claim 2: Reconsideration of the rejection of Claim 2 "under 35 U. S. C. 103 as being unpatentable over Hunter '056" is requested. Applicant cannot find in Hunter '056 "a locking means" between the other contact member 63 and actuating means 54 to prevent movement between said other contact member 63 and said ring gear 36 when said ring gear 36 places said other contact member 63 against said actuating means 54 to drive it. Claim 2 has been copied in independent form including essential limitations of Claim 1, with said one contact member now being mounted for rotation by said ring

gear, and has been amended to clarify its reading by positively calling for "the locking means".

Claim 3, only objected to as depending from a rejected base claim, has been copied in independent form including essential limitations of Claim 1, with said one contact member now being mounted for rotation by said ring gear.

Claim 4, only objected to as depending from a rejected base claim, has been copied in independent form including essential limitations of Claim 1, with said one contact member now being mounted for rotation by said ring gear.

Claim 5, only objected to as depending from a rejected base claim, has been copied in independent form including essential limitations of Claim 4, with said one contact member now being mounted for rotation by said ring gear; however, "cap" and "cap member" have been changed to -- cap means -- for a consistent reading, and "an arrowhead" on said "top surface" has been changed to -- a first indicating means -- and "an arrowhead" on said end of said shaft means has been changed to -- a second indicating means --. The use of "arrowhead" is believed to unnecessarily restrict the claim. These changes do not alter the "allowable" status of the claim.

Claim 6, only objected to as depending from a rejected base claim, is dependent on Claim 4.

Claim 7, only objected to as depending from a rejected

base claim, has been copied in independent form including essential limitations of Claim 1, with said one contact member now being mounted for rotation by said ring gear. The term "radial projection", where it appeared, has been changed to -- radial projection means -- to have a proper reading throughout the claim. These changes do not alter the "allowable" status of the claim.

Claim 8, only objected to as depending from a rejected base claim, has been copied in independent form including essential limitations of Claim 7, with said one contact member now being mounted for rotation by said ring gear, and has been amended to define effect of serrations to clarify its reading on a portion of the base claim. These changes do not alter the "allowable" status of the claim.

Claim 9, only objected to as depending from a rejected base claim, is dependent on Claim 7; however, Claim 9 has been amended so that "radial projection" now reads -- radial projection means -- to properly refer to Claim 7. The words "to contact" have been deleted and -- and -- has been inserted to give a clear reading of the action of the mating surfaces. These changes do not alter the "allowable" status of the claim.

Claim 10: Reconsideration of the rejection of Claim 10 "under 35 U. S. C. 103 as being unpatentable over Hunter '056" is requested. Claim 10 has been amended to have it stand alone with said one contact member being mounted for rotation by said ring gear, the cylindrical member located radially inwardly from said ring gear with the cylindrical member having a radially outwardly extending "other contact member" with an

outer radial end, said connecting means connecting said outer radial end to said ring gear; said ring gear having a hollow shaft with said cylindrical member being mounted for rotation therewith. The "cylindrical member 37 of Hunter '056" is the equivalent of applicant's "hollow shaft".

Claim 11, only objected to as depending from a rejected base claim, has been copied in independent form including essential limitations of Claim 1, said one contact member being mounted for rotation by said ring gear.

Claim 12, only objected to as depending from a rejected base claim, is dependent on Claim 11.

Claim 13, only objected to as depending from a rejected base claim, has been copied in independent form including essential limitations of Claim 1, said one contact member being mounted for rotation by said ring gear.

Claim 14, only objected to as depending from a rejected base claim, has been copied in independent form including essential limitations of Claim 1, said one contact member being mounted for rotation by said ring gear.

Claims 15-19, indicated as "allowable over the prior art of record", appear as filed.

Claim 20, indicated as "allowable over the prior art of record", has been amended to clarify its reading. The locking desired is between the output gear means and second contact means and this amendment now spells that out.

Claims 21-23, indicated as "allowable over the prior art of record", appear as filed.

Claim 24, indicated as "allowable over the prior art of record", has been amended to change "an arrowhead" on

said top surface to -- a first indicating means -- and to change "an arrowhead" on said end of said shaft to -- a second indicating means --.

Claims 25 and 26, indicated as "allowable over the prior art of record", appear as filed.

Claims 27-29: Reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 27-29 "under 35 U. S. C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Hunter '056" is requested:

(1) Claim 27 has been amended to clarify its reading by placing alternately in the "means for moving said gear cage", and specifically setting forth that the "first means for biasing" is included in the "means for alternately moving said gear cage". The word and has been added before the "second means for biasing said gear cage".

The Examiner has stated that, "Spring means 56 of Hunter respectively comprise 'first' and 'second' biasing means"; however, the two overcenter springs 56 of Hunter are the equivalent of the two overcenter springs 90 and 92 of applicant and both springs represent the "first means for biasing said gear cage in one direction or the other direction". The two springs 56 act to perform the same function at the same time -- urge trip member 52 to "one extreme position or the other" (see Column 3, lines 50, 51).

Hunter does not have the equivalent of the "second means for biasing said gear cage in one direction to maintain said first drive gear in

driving engagement when said first means for biasing has been removed. This "second means for biasing said gear cage" is spring means 39 of applicant.

If the Examiner repeats this rejection, it would be appreciated if he would set forth where the "second means for biasing said gear cage in one direction to maintain said first drive gear in driving engagement when said first means for biasing has been removed" can be found in Hunter '056.

(2) Claim 28 is dependent on Claim 27 and has been amended to include also for setting forth that "said second means is also for biasing said gear cage in the other direction". This covers the action of spring means 39 in both directions.

(3) Claim 29 is dependent on Claim 27 and defines the action of the second means biasing said gear cage in one direction as related to the first biasing means as it is removed from said gear cage, therefore not biasing said gear cage in said one direction. Each spring means 56 of Hunter has an identical function, both spring means 56 providing one "first means for biasing said gear cage in one direction or the other". No separate "second means for biasing said gear cage" can be found in Hunter '056.

Claim 30, only objected to as depending from a rejected base claim, is dependent on Claim 27.

Claim 31, only objected to as depending from a rejected base claim, is dependent on Claim 27; however, Claim 31 has been amended to add "at least" before -- until -- and at its end by changing "second" direction to -- other -- direction, to provide proper antecedent. This new wording clarifies the reading of the claim. These changes do not alter the "allowable" status of the claim.

Claims 32, 33, 35 and 36 have been rejected. Reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 32 and 33 "under 35 U. S. C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Roberts" is requested.

(1) Claim 32 has been amended to positively include "said output gear having an axis" with said gear cage being mounted for pivotal movement around the axis of said output gear. Said first and second drive gears both are now specifically called for as in continuous engagement with said output gear.

Applicant has tried to read Claim 32 (amended) on Roberts and cannot do so. While Roberts has a gear cage (plate 20) with two drive gears (22 and 24), these drive gears (22 and 24) are not both in continuous engagement with an output gear (34); further, the gear cage (plate 20) is not mounted for pivotal movement around the axis of said output gear (34).

If the Examiner repeats this rejection, it would be appreciated if it could be shown how Claim 32 (amended) reads on Roberts. Clarification

of this rejection will aid applicant in deciding whether to further amend or cancel this claim, or appeal the action.

(2) Claim 33, dependent on Claim 32, has been amended to include that said means for pivoting said gear cage has a toggle device, said gear cage and toggle device being mounted for separate pivotal movement around the same axis.

Applicant has tried to read Claim 33 (amended) on Roberts and cannot do so. Roberts has a toggle device (lever 26) pivotally attached to the gear cage (plate 20), said gear cage and toggle device are not mounted for separate pivotal movement around the same axis.

(3) Claim 35 has been canceled.

(4) Claim 36 has been canceled.

Claims 34 and 38 have been rejected. Reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 34 and 38 "under 35 U. S. C. 103 as being unpatentable over Hunter '056 in view of Roberts" is requested.

(1) Claim 34, dependent on Claim 33, has been amended to include that the transmission has a base member with an upstanding fixed center cylindrical member, said gear cage and toggle device being mounted for separate pivotal movement on said fixed center cylindrical member.

The Examiner states that "Roberts teaches a transmission with gears arranged as recited by applicant". However, it is believed that Claim 32

(amended), a base claim of Claim 34, now clearly defines over Roberts as set forth above. The Examiner then states that "It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have substituted gear arrangement as suggested and taught by Roberts for that of the Hunter '056 transmission". Until the applicant knows just how the gear arrangement of Roberts is substituted in Hunter '056, he cannot comment on the obviousness of the substitution. If the gear arrangement of Roberts is substituted in Hunter, as taught by Roberts, the "first and second drive gears" would not be in continuous engagement with the "output gear"; the "gear cage" would not be "mounted for pivotal movement around the axis of said output gear" -- both Roberts and Hunter have gear cages pivoted around the axis of the input gear; and the "gear cage and toggle device" would not be "mounted for separate pivotal movement" on a fixed center cylindrical member.

Here again, if this rejection is repeated, applicant requests that an obvious combination of Hunter and Roberts be described on which Claim 34 as amended will read.

(2) Claim 38, dependent on Claim 34, has been amended to specifically set forth that the spring means is located between "said fixed center cylindrical member and said toggle device" and acts "outwardly on said toggle device". Neither

Hunter nor Roberts shows or teaches this arrangement.

Claim 37, only objected to as depending from a rejected base claim, is dependent on Claim 33.

New Claim 39 depends on Claim 34 and calls for a toggle device comprising a circular plate having a cut-out portion for locating the spring means; said plate and gear cage having a center opening placed on the center cylindrical member.

New Claim 40 calls for a broad recitation of the oscillating means with a specific toggle device having a plate with said plate biased outwardly to move it in one direction or the other.

New Claim 41 depends on Claim 40 and locates the spring means in the cut-out portion.

New Claim 42 depends on Claim 2 and specifically calls for the mating surfaces on said other contact member and said actuating means.

New Claim 43 has been drawn to cover a transmission as set forth in Claim 27 in more detail with different wording.

New Claim 44 depends on Claim 43 and calls for said second biasing means also directly biasing said gear cage in said one direction.

New Claim 45 depends on Claim 43 and calls for a downward projection on said gear cage having a surface on which said second biasing means acts.

New Claim 46 depends on Claim 45 wherein said surface is contoured to vary the effect of the second biasing means.

New Claim 47 has been fashioned after Claim 21 and includes serrations on the inner surface of said annular flange and a pointer for engaging said serrations, along with specific reference to a centerbody means.

New Claim 48 has been fashioned after Claim 47 and includes serrations on the inner surface of said hollow shaft and said centerbody means having short vanes engaging said serrations.

New Claim 49 has been fashioned after Claims 47 and 48 with serrations around one of said inner surfaces and serration engaging means connecting said cylindrical member and first projection to said serrations.

New Claim 50 depends on Claim 49, limiting said serrations to the inner surface of said annular flange and said serration engaging means to a pointer.

New Claim 51 depends on Claim 49, limiting said serrations to the inner surface of said hollow output shaft, and said serration engaging means is connected to said cylindrical member and has vane means engaging said serrations.

New Claim 52 depends on Claim 49 and includes a shaft extending into said hollow output shaft for rotating said cylindrical member to set a predetermined angle between said first projection and said second projection.

New Claim 53 depends on Claim 52 and includes indicating means so one can see what angle the output shaft is set to oscillate through.

New Claim 54 depends on Claim 53 and calls for a cap means with specific means indicating angular movement of said cap means.

New Claim 55 depends on Claim 54 and calls for a nozzle opening in said cap means, and means for directing liquid to said nozzle opening through said hollow shaft.

New Claim 56 depends on Claim 55 and aligns said first indicating means with said nozzle opening.

New Claim 57 depends on Claim 11 and includes nozzle means on said cylindrical member and means for directing liquid thereto.

New Claim 58 depends on Claim 57 and includes indicating means so one can see what angle the nozzle means is set to oscillate through.

New Claim 59 depends on Claim 58 and includes indicia for indicating angular movement of said nozzle means, a first indicating means connected to said hollow shaft for indicating one end of angular movement, and a second indicating means on said nozzle means for indicating the other end of said angular movement.

New Claim 60 depends on Claim 4 and adds a nozzle means thereto for receiving a liquid flow.

New Claim 61 depends on Claim 60 and includes indicating means so one can see what angle the cap is set to oscillate through.

New Claim 62 is fashioned after Claim 15 to read on the first spring means biasing the gear cage in only one direction.

In review, a total of fifty-nine (59) claims now appear, of which twenty (20) are independent. As of this amendment, there are twenty-one (21) more total claims than filed, and fifteen (15) more independent claims than filed. Eight (8) of the additional independent claims came from placing original dependent claims 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13 and 14 in

independent form to obtain allowance.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks,
this application is now believed to be in condition for
allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CARL L. C. KAH, JR.

By


Jack N. McCarthy
Agent of Record



JNMC:jco

655 Bimini Road,
Satellite Beach, FL 32937
Telephone: (305) 773-2081

December 29, 1987

CLCK-86

-38-

Date of Deposit 12/29/87 Mailing Label No. B24450933
I hereby verify that this amendment, including any drawing referred
to therein, is being deposited with the U. S. Postal Service "Express
Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 CFR 1.10 on the date
indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner of Patents and
Trademarks, Washington, D. C. 20231, and this statement was made with
the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are
punishable by fine and/or imprisonment under 18 USC 1001 and may jeo-
pardize the validity of the application or any patent issuing thereon.
 
Person Mailing Paper Jack N. McCarthy - Agent of Record